1922. (Draupadi)

File No. 459-22

Serial Nos. 1-9 & 16 & 23.

Previous References.
Misc. 231-18-3 & 1-2
" 97-08-1-9
" 114-23 1-2
" 46-06-1-12
38-01

Later references 1-5
" 459-22-10 & 15
" 97-08-10 & 11
175.26-1-2
Misc 180-27-1

GENERAL & REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 17

Part B for July 1925.

SUBJECT

Recommends that the Govt Advocate may be requested to appear on behalf of Govt. in the Draupadi Widow's case

G.O. No. 131-3
Dated 28.7.25

To the Misc Court
" Comptroller
Govt. Adv.

The Draupadi Counsel's recommendation is sanctioned.

G. R. S. III—1] 191

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

NOTES.

File No.

FILE HEADING.

Sarasa Juraja Vaden's Case

From

No.	Dated	Received
Diary No.	Enclos. Spare Copies.	Serial No.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

NOTES—First Sheet.

WD 1232—GPB—20,000—18-11-15

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Govt Advocate Can requesting documents of 1812 and 1815 in connection with O.S. No. 770 1918-19 on the file of the Sub-Judge of Bangalore.

It takes some time longer to trace out these papers, a Memo requesting the Govt Advocate to move for a short adjournment is submitted.

The case is about to come off on the 29th inst.

Submitted

27.1.23

Written on small slips, pied, or slips pasted on

W/ the Govt Advr No. 2153 dy 27-1-23

1510.

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

Requests him to obtain
Stamp assignment as it
takes time & sticks the
2 documents rept to big Comm.

The Vern records may
be requested to send up
the ancient documents
hereto

27/11/23

Vern Records

WR Gen: 499/29-1-23.

Rec'd 12-30 P.M.
29/11/23

From the Tamil Duffir No: 40 lodged in the Vernacular Records of the G. R. S, Copies of the following are herewith published

(1) Copy of Sannad granting Annasa maraua hally & 6 other villages as Jodi for 246 Varahas 8 fanams & half, including Kempalingapura (in question) on 20th September 1812.

(2) Copy of Bengalore Foujdari Sarkeel to the Amildar of Devanhalli dated the 7th day of Bhadrapada Shuddha of the year Yuva (1815)

(3) Copy of Kyfiat with Patta of the Jodi village of Kempalingapura passed on the 12th day of Sravana Bahula of the year Yuva (1815) with the Bengalore Foujdari Sarkeel to the Amildar of Devanhalli referred to in (2).

To. The Superintendent Government Records
with Compliments

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be cipoed, or slips pasted on this form.

1/12/23.

G. R. S. 111—5]

4

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

5 The Vern. Records may also be consulted as to the time (3) the copies of documents may be sent on to the Govt. Advocate for production in Court.

6 Unauthenticated documents available in the Records are hardly used for purposes of reference in the Secretariat. The orders of mutations & documents are not generally granted. Yes —

M
— 2-2-1925 2/2/25

Vern Records

The copies of the Samvat and the Kyphayat Patte and the Jabtee of 1815 are all unauthenticated & are lodged in the Duftur.

There is an abstract of the Samvat inquiries in particulars called Jare Pramathi Jodi accounts of Devarahalli Taluk.

Copies put up may be sent to the Govt Advocate for such action as he may find necessary with a note that an abstract of the Jabtee is available in the authenticated Jodi accounts also. Unauthenticated copies are also given to parties. 2/2/25.

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

2/2/25 Rec'd 4-50 p.m.

G. R. S. III—3]

1510

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

BL 5/12/33

The Govt Advocate states that the case came on for trial & dismissed in the 31st March 1933, and was dismissed with costs – (letter of 28.9.33)

Submitted

BL 10.10.33

The papers may be filed

BL 10/10/33

Yes 12.10.33

Note.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be reimposed or slips pasted on this form.

6

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

H.

From, The Govt Advocate,
Letter no 260 Dt 29.10.23

Submits a Bill for
Rs 300/ being his re-
muneration for Service
rendered on behalf of
Govt in O.S. no 77
1918-9
on the file of The Sub
Judge, Bangalore

The Bill is countersigned
by The Sub Judge.

The authority under
which The Govt Advo.
conducted the case, is not
readily traceable.

May The pp. be sent
on to The Insp. Concy
for report

Submitted. The Hon'ble
6-11-23. Mr. Rice

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

W D 1660—GPB—1,50,000—25-21

G R S III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc, not intended for permanent record.]

Report upon what
circumstances the Govt Advocate
had to conduct the case,
and how the Court has to
be met. The Cmd papers
may be sent up & perused
to-day.

In the meantime, the
Govt Advocate may also be
informed that the subject
of this title is under consideration.

Draft

B.L.
6.11.23

12.11.23

Dft. submitted.

B.L.
13/11/23

13/11/23

2 drafts to apptl

14.11.23

Rec'd.

15/11/23

N 3—Should routine notes be written on small slips, these notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

Done

15.11.23

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

4 To the Govt Advocate. No. 724/d 23.11.23.— Stating that the subject is under consideration and that necessary action will be taken on the bill as early as possible.

To the Mercy. Commy. No. 725 d. 23.11.23.— Forwards copy of letter in pl. 3 together with the bill and requests him to represent the circumstances under which the Govt Advocate had to conduct the case & how the cost may be met.

Sig

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

W D 1660—GPE—1,50,000—2/5/21

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips past the notes must be copied, or this form.

S/16
588

9

R. S. III. 2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 459 of 1922

Serial No.

6 From the Govt Advocate No. 362 of 6.12.23 Returns the file of papers sent to him from this office re C.S. 77 of 18-9 on the file of the Subjudge's Court, Bangalore & requests that

a draft Order in pursuance of the decree passed in the above suit may be issued, after which the Muz Court is also pleased to issue a Cheque for the amount payable from what source &c.

Draft
10/12/23

10/12/23.

7 To the Govt Advocate. No. 816 d. 12.12.23. Acknowledges receipt of the file of papers noted to above and states that the question of his bill is under the consideration of Govt.

Draft to the Muz Court is submitted.

13/12/23 4/12/23

26.12.23.

(The Draft was not signed, as the Muz. Court sent up another Court Note on the Subject.

Write to the Muz Court in Court that the said papers have been recd from the G.A. stating the source for which the amount of the bill can be met.

13/2/23

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0361—GPB—3750—1-8-22

S. III. 2]

78

(D)

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 459 of 192 ?—

Serial No.	
8.	From, the Muz. Comr Letter no. C. 492 dy 23-12-23. Forwards a copy of the Govt. Advocate's letter stating (J) that he conducted the case under orders conveyed in this office letter no. Muz. 231-18 dy 23rd. January 1919, (J) and states that he is not in a position to point out the source from which the copy Govt. Advocate's bill will have to be met without knowing the circumstances which led to the above Comr. being directed, Muz. J. no. 231-18 will be forwarded to the Muz. Comr. who will be asked to point out the source of meeting the amount specified in the G. A's Bill. Submitted.

(vide D)

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22 4/5

18-1-24 19.1.24

21.1.24.

787

R. S. 111-21

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 459 of 1922

Serial No. 1

Dft. Submitted

AG 23-1-24

SD 23.1.24

JS 25.1.24

9 To the Muzrai Commr. No. 1018 d. 26.1.24.

Forwards for report & return Muz. File No. 231-18 on the subject.

From Muzrai Comm.r

Refers J. no. 231-18 & his letter no. C. 492 d. 5-1-24 which is sealed & kept in SR 18 (vide linked file)

The papers may be received.

Submitted

AG 11.6.24

JS 30.7.24

7 The Hon the Jus advocate may be asked to state if any and for what purpose & for a copy of the judgment under direction to disposal of the Govt. on receipt of the Govt. to be forwarded to the Govt. when it can be dispensed with & returned

Submitted for Hon'ble

WD 0561 - GPB—3750—1 8.22

NOTE—Contn. sheet

76 9297 7.K.L

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 459 of 192

Serial No.

Dr. Subrao
15.8.29 Bh 16/8/29
Issue SMR 16/8

16 To the Govt Advocate. N. 24. d. 19.8.29
Requests him to obtain Decree & Judgment

Judgment in the Munsiff's Court Subordinate has decreed in paragraph 19 that the Plaintiff should pay the Costs of defendants 1 & 2 viz the Govt of Mysore and Huvinamakkalu mutt respectively. all costs of suit have to come from the Plaintiff & not apportioned between Govt & Mutt. Order on page 11 Supra.

29/9.12

11-29 Asst Secy 11/9

19/9/29

Note—Contn sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

Serial No.

32) Though the first case ~~was~~ was marked to Deputy in the Court, as the object of the Court was to dispense the 2nd Deputy (the Honorary Member) of the Inam lands in question & Board Court for the first, I think the Court should be asked to fix a day for advocates' fees. ~~The~~ The Court may accordingly be asked to be addressed ~~by further order~~ in the matter of the enclosed report.

33) The first advocate may be also asked to report what action has been taken to recover the undisbursed fees of the Deputy in the Court, as ordered by the Court.

2D

34) D&S. Secretary

A.G. 2-1-25 2/1/25

35) Store 31.1.25.

18 To the Govt Advocate in Mysore. No. 989 dt. 7.1.25. Requests him to intimate the action taken to recover the sister's fees & the defendant's costs in the suit as ordered

WD 0561 - GPB—3750—1 8 22

G. R. S. III. 2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 459 of 1922.

Serial No.

19 By the Muz. Comr.
no. 990 Dy 7.1.25

States that the defdt. matt should be asked to pay the Govt. Advocate's Bill and requested him to address the matt in the matter and report the result.

From, The Govt Advocate.
Letter no 633 Dy 20-1-25.
Furnishes the information called for in Sl. 18.

36) The Govt Advocate states that the plaintiff being a pauper no action could be taken for the recovery of the costs, that he applied to the Chief Court after service of notice of appeal and under orders of that Court, the plaintiff executed a surety bond in favor of the Court for costs in both the Courts

-Contn sheet

WD 0561-GPB-3750-1 8 22

G. R. S. III. 2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. of 192 2

Serial No.

and that further action will have to be taken after the disposal of the appeal now pending before the Ch. Court.

37) The Asst. Comr. Kolar may be asked to Submit. Reply of the Asst. Comr. No 990 & 7/1/25 - May be awaited as also the further development in the case in the Chief Court.

AL
28-1-1925.

BL
28-1-25

38) Mr Perusal
29.1.25.

728
29.1.25 2nd member).

39) Mr
13
Perusal
14.2.25.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

D. O. No. 97

GEN. & R.L. 29MAY1925 BUZR

Dy. 1828

GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE'S CHAMBERS,
PUBLIC OFFICES,
Bangalore, 25th May 1925

Dear Mr Anantaraman,

In connection with the professional services rendered by me in O.S. No 77 of 1829 (Siva Kavije Wodeyar & Government of Mysore) on the file of the Subordinate Judge, Bangalore I sent up a bill for Rs 300/- with this Office Letter No 260 dated 29-10-1923. More than 18 months have elapsed since then the bill has not been sanctioned.

May I request you to kindly expedite the matter?

Thanking you,

I remain
Yours truly
H Narasimha Iyengar

Anantaraman Esq: Bar,
Revenue Secretariat to Government, Bangalore

A.1
22/5

Notes.

[i., not intended for permanent record]

The letter of 29.10.1923
has not been received
in the Qua'i Branch
and the subject matter
of the case has not been
given. Quai'i Branch
may perhaps be consulted

2.7.5.25 MMS

28 5/25

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

17

J.R.S. III—31

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

The Inns of Court has been asked to address that Bath as to why it should not pay the Incl. Advocate's Bill, and his reply is awaited

Mr Secretary has also the matter.

Secretary

Mr

Mr

30.525

How long did it all [illegible] Was what in a [illegible] court?

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form

1.6.25.

D. 1628
Amst 459-22

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions etc., not intended for permanent

43) Hunsomarnahalli mats is not under Sri M. Mysore

Srikantiah
M 26.6.25 26/25

3.6.25.

Rec-Sheristadar (Lch) Is any grant made for the mats of Hunsomarnahalli?

4.6.25.

45) The mats is endowed with Pura, Chick Obanahalli and other main Villages.

As per statement of income and expr. presented by the Agent of this mats in 1908, it is seen that the income from all sources was Rs 3600/- a year.

Srikantiah
M 8/6/25

9.6.25 Asst-Supdt 11.6.25

1928

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

47/1 does not appear to be necessary, or even desirable to postpone the first advocate's bill pending decision of the question of recovering the amount from the [illegible] party. The [illegible] ing is read to question of having passed the first advocate appointed are to [illegible]

15/6

290/16 15/6

11.6.25

47/1 I agree. Pay the account paid by the first advocate with leave to be heard on an adverse application if any question of recovery from the [illegible] party arises.

19.6.25

19/6

N B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

187.

20

5447 of 24

S.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

---

(1) Mr Gulati

M
22.6.25.

22/6/25

(2) From what sanction
the amount was paid first?
Please see it & let me know
Thereafter

23.6.25

(3) The amount may be paid as an advance subject to adjustment in due course from the provision made in the Budget under 18, Courts of Law.

(2) Law Officers Fees &c. Advocates and Officers Law charges. May be the Budget be consulted?

Gulati

V.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

M 23/6/25

23-6-25 23.6.25

(1) Noted (2) The matter is now for the Finl Deptt to decide.

23.6.25

12

G.R.S III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

1828 22

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

Subst: for [illegible]

[illegible]

The enclosed addition in the margin of the draft may be omitted. If the charge is a reasonable advance it can not be met from the provision for law charges.

Very early action is necessary to recover the amt: if recovery is not possible and the charge is in the public interests the Comptr has to be asked to classify it as a fair charge & Crown and authorise the advance

[illegible]
1/7/25

[illegible]

Delay the draft as modified by the Sec? be issued?
Sec? 24 2.7.25

N.B. Should routine [illegible] be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

58 19 25

G R.S III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc, not intended for permanent record.]

58) In order on the above
Member present 18 6 25

2 7 25.

63/27. 18 Member)

59) [illegible]

3/7

3 7

60) Same

3.7.25.

From the Inter Comp
Letter no 492 dt 3.7.25.
Reports that as the
Hon Somanagalu Mal
is unwilling to bear the
Cost of Govt Advs. Bill,
the amount may be
met from the provision
under Law charges,
and requests that the Bill

N B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form

G. R. S. III. 2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 459 of 1922.

Serial No.

From, the Muz. Commr., Letter no. 492 dt 3.7.25.

Reports that as the Hanumanmahalli mall is unwilling to pay the first Advocate's Bill, it may be paid from the provisions under Law-charges &c

The Muz. Commr explains the facts of the case.

7

a) Sriapuje Vadeu has furnished security for costs and the first Advocate's Bill has to be paid from it after the case is disposed of.

b) The Muz. Commr requests that the first Adv may be authorised to appear on behalf of Govt and conduct the case.

c) The S.O. vide draft Bill is [illegible]

Secy.

7.7

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561-GPB-3750-1 8 22

121

25

29

Mus. 459 — 22 — 23.

May the order nisi absolute (and
under seal) issue?

Or

May the file be sent to the Pl. Branch
for opinion as to the proposal made
by the Mug Cur: viz that the Govt.
Advocate fee may be debited to the
Income Tax. Head under Law Charges?

Sd
7.7.25

7.7.25.

182 Members)

16/7/25

65) The order drop. already
approved may be issued

Sd
7/7

Sd
8/7

8.7.25.

Sl. 22. 20. m. Counsel, Complts & Govt Advocate.
No 25-7 Dy 9.8.25.
Summonses the bill
for Rs 300 - and requires the
Mus Cur: to submit the
proposed petition of appeal

R. S. III-2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. | of 192

Serial No.

66) The Govt. Advocate's letter has been sent.

Paragraph 2 of the Muz. Comr's letter regarding the Govt. Advocate conducting the case in the Ch. C. requires orders. May the Govt. Advocate be authorized to appear and conduct the case, the costs being met from the security amount, if the case is posted to the Ch. C.

(A)

13.7.25

13/7/25 Regd

Rec'd Regd

13.7.25.

325/147

67) (A) Yes. This may be done

14) Regd

14.7.25.

21.7.25.

Rec'd Regd 68) Applc 23/7

23.7.25.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 S 22

G.R. S. III. 2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 459 of 1922

Serial No.	
23.	To. Dnyr Comm, Comptr and Legal Advocate No 131—3 dy 28.7.22 Same as the Dnyr Comm's recommendation that the Govt be moved [illegible]

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 1570

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* 191 .

Date of issue 9.2.23

Signed by Mr. T.E.J. Nigar

Section Mun

File No. 45 J-

Serial No

No. 2232

Time

To

The Govt Advocate.

Sir,

I am directed to request you will kindly advise in your letter no. 367 - D 25th January 19. 40 about 0.5 no Yr of J.P.C. on the file of the Sub Judge of Bangalore Srinivasa Iyengar Vs Govt of Mysore and Others), I am directed to forward herewith copies of the Memorandum documents

over.

(i) Samvat Yr 20.7.1812 (Angira Sa Samvatsara) to April, Sesisoosan and others of Devanahalli

(ii) Jaresof the year 1815 (Yuvara Samvatsara) attested & the Amil Dasoobantu of Devanahalli,

(iii) Mysore Kaifiat of 1875 A.D. Vol. 2

Ven. regarding the Secty from the unauthenticated original documents lodged in the Registry there, and to state that an abstract of the Journal is available in the authenticated Registry also.

I have the

Registrar

11.1.23

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

14177

1879
D

WD 978—GPB—500—22-11-21

29/9
30

11618

WD 978—GPB—500—22-11-21

No. 206

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE IN MYSORE,
*Dated Bangalore.*28th..September...*192* 3.

FROM

The Government Advocate in Mysore,
BANGALORE.



D 396

Muz. 459-22-2.

To

The Secretary to the Government
of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue Department, BANGALORE.

SIR

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No.2232/Muz. dated the 9th February 1923, I have the honour to state that Original Suit No.77 of 1918-19 (Sivapooja Waderu VS. Government of Mysore) on the file of the Subordinate Judge, Bangalore Division, came on for final disposal on the 31st March 1923, and was dismissed with costs.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Government Advocate.

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

1879 37

WD 978—GPB—500—22-11-21

14177

No. 260

Exc. 1 Bill

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE IN MYSORE,
Dated Bangalore..27th..October.....1923.

70/17

Muz. 459-22-3.

The Government Advocate in Mysore,
BANGALORE.



To

The Secretary to the Government
of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue Department, BANGALORE.

SIR

In continuation of this Office letter No.206 dated the 28th September 1923, I have the honour to forward herewith for the sanction of Government a Bill for Rs.300/- only, being my remuneration for professional services rendered on behalf of Government in Original Suit No.77 of 1918-19 on the file of the Subordinate Judge, Bangalore Division, (Sivapooje Woderu VS. The Government of Mysore). The Bill has been duly countersigned by the Subordinate Judge.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Government Advocate.

Professional

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

32

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

2 DHP

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section Mmz.

File No. 459-22.

Serial No 4.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 191 .

No. 724

Date of issue 23.11.23

Signed by M.T. Ramaiya

To

The Govt. Pleader

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 260 of 29th Oct. 23 submitting a bill for Rs 300/- being remuneration for professional services rendered in D.J. No. 77 of 1918-19 on the file of the Subordinate, Bangalore, I am directed to state that the subject is under consideration

over.

33 A.S

as that necessary action will be taken in the Bill as early as possible.

Yours &c.

W. Ismay

14.11.23.

Rec'd 2

84

13/11/23

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

Muz 4]

SUBJECT 2.M.57

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Section Mz.
File No. 58-22.
Serial No.

Muzrai Secretariat
( )
, *the* 192 .

No. 725
Occ

Date of issue 23.11.23

To

The Muzrai Comr

Signed by Mr. T. Ramaiya

Sir,

In forwarding herewith a copy of letter no. 260 Dy 29th Oct. 1923 from the Supt Govt Arc. in Mysore together with a Bill for Rs 300/- for Survey rendered

(over.)

35

on the file of the Sub
Judge, Bangalore Dist,
(Siddapuja Vaderu Vs
Govt of Mysore),
I am directed to
request that you will
be so good as to repeat
the circumstances under
which the Govt Pleader
has to conduct the
said case, and how the
amount
cost of the Bill has
to be met. The concerned papers may be forwarded
to the Hon'ble Judges. I have &c

W/14/11.

W/15/11

Sd/- Rao - Secretary

Copy to the Govt
Pleader with reference
his letter dy 29-10-1923

BO

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

Vide separate
Draft

WD 0563—GPB—2 500—27 7 22

36

WD 978—GPB—500—22-11-21

No. 362 / File (containing 4 sheets and 2 Notes Sheet)

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE IN MYSORE,
Dated Bangalore...6th..December.....192 3.

GEN. & REV. DEPTT. 1 DEC 1923 MUZRA 688

GEN. & REV. DEPTT. 1 MAR 1923

18723

ST

FROM

The Government Advocate in Mysore,
BANGALORE.

Muz. 459-22-6.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue Department, Bangalore.

SIR

In continuation of this office letter No. 360, dated the 29th October 1923, I have the honor to return herewith the entire file of papers which had been sent to this office from the Secretariat, for conducting Original Suit No. 77 of 1918-19, on the file of the Subordinate Judge, Bangalore, (Sivapooje Woderu VS. The Government of Mysore) and to request that the receipt of the same may be kindly acknowledged.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Government Advocate

G. S. VI—G/32]

37

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 68

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the *191* .

Date of issue 12-12-23

Signed by T. Ramaiya

Section Secy

File No. Lesg-22

Serial No 7

No. 816

To

The Govt Advocate

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge receipt of the file of papers ref^d with Govt Memo No 362 dated the 6th Dec^r 23 and to state that the question of Govt-bills is under consideration of Govt

Please see
10/12/23

Put up
8/12/23

over.

10/12/23

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

21057

38

C No. 492 / 2 / 1923-24

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Dated Bangalore, 27th December 1923.

From



Chandy, Esquire., B.A.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

782
Muz.459-22-8

To

K. V. Anantaraman, Esquire., B.A.,
Offg.Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.725/M.F.459-22-5 dated 23rd November 1923 in re the claim of the Government Advocate for Rs.300/- for services rendered by him in original suit No.77 of 1918-19 on the file of the Sub Judge - Bangalore (Sivapuja Woderu VS Government), I have the honor to forward herewith copy of Government Advocate's --- letter No.363 dated 6th December 1923 with its enclosure stating that the case was conducted at the instance of the Joint Secretary to --- Government, Muzrai Department as desired in his letter No.1962/M.F. 231-18-3 dated 23rd January 1919. In the absence of the connected records which can give information leading to the circumstances under which the Government Advocate was instructed to conduct the case, I am not in a position to express any definite opinion as to the source from which the cost may be met.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

KSR.

Copy of letter No.1962/Muz.F.231-18-3 dated the 23rd January 1919, from the Joint Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Muzrai Department, to the Government Advocate in Mysore, Bangalore.

"I am directed to forward herewith notice in Mis.Application No.184 of 1918-19 on the file of the Sub Judge's court, Bangalore, in the matter of a suit instituted against the Mysore Government by Cheif Secretary in forma pauperis for the restoration of the Jodi village of Kempalingapura in the Devanahalli Taluk, and to request that you will be so good as to appear on behalf of Goverment and oppose the application.

---

for Muzrai Commissioner.

KSR.

28/1/19.

Letter No.363 dated 6th December 1923 from the Government -- Advocate in Mysore to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

"With reference to your letter No.C.492 of 1923-24, dated the 1st December 1923, I have the honor to state that it was at the --- instance of the Joint Secretary to Government, Muzrai Department, as desired in his letter No.1962/Muz.231-18-3, dated the 23rd January 1919, that I conducted the case re: Sivapooje Woderu VS. The Government of Mysore. (Original Suit No.77 of 1918-19, on the file of the Subordinate Judge, Bangalore). A copy of the said letter is forwarded herewith for your information as desired.

P-S. O.S. No.77 of 1918-19 is only a continuation of the --- proceedings initiated by filing mis.appeal No.184 of 1918-19.

"Copy"

KSR.

for Muzrai Commissioner.

28/12/23

41

Muz 4]

SUBJECT ....

....

....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Section Muz.
File No. 459-22.
Serial No. 9.

Muzrai Secretariat
( )
, *the* 192 .

No. 1018

To

Date of issue 26-1-24

The Muzrai Comr.

Signed by Geo. T. Rauniar Lt,

Adverting to your letter No. C. 492 dy 27th Dec. 23 forwarding a copy of the Govt. Advocate's letter stating that he conducted O.S. No 77 of 1918-9 on the file of the Sub Judge, Bangalore (Sriarapuje Moderen vs Govt.) under instructions conveyed

over.

42 No. 1962-Insp. 231-18

in this office Com. No. of 23-1-1919 (J)
and stating that it is not
possible to point out the
source from which the cost
of the Govt. Advocate's Bill
~~bill has to~~ can be met without
connected records
~~knowing the circumstances~~
~~which led to the above~~
~~Comm.~~ I am directed
for ref. & return
to forward herewith Insp.
J. No. 231-18 ~~leading to~~
on the subject. ~~It may be stated that~~
~~the said communication, of Jany. 1919~~
and to request that you
will be so kind as to
point out the source of
meeting the amount
specified in the Govt.
Advs. Bill —
I have etc.

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

D 25.1.24

SD 28.1.24 Dy Rev. Secy.

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27 7-22

43

Muz 4]

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Section e Mug.
File No. 459-22
Serial No. 16

Muzrai Secretariat
( )
, *the* 192 .

No. 240

Date of issue 19.8.24

To

The Asst Adv

Signed by Mr. T. Ramaiya

Sir,

Adverting to Correspondence ending with your letter no. 260 dy 29-10-1923 in the matter of your Bill for ~~Rs~~ 300/ being your remuneration for services rendered in O.S. no. 49 of 1918-9

over.

on the file of the
Sub Judge, Bangalore
City (Swapuje
Vaderu vs the Govt
of Mysore), I am
directed to request
you will be so good as
to obtain and send for
perusal a copy of
the Sub Judge's Order
directing the dismissal
the Suit.

I have etc.

SMR
16/8

Rev. Secretary.
16.8.22

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27 7 22

2440

No. 488
Enc. 1

105

WD 978—GPB—500—22-11-21

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE IN MYSORE,
Dated Bangalore. 26th ....November...*1924*.

FROM

The Government Advocate in Mysore,
BANGALORE.

26 NOV 1924

27 NOV 1924

Dno. 767.
Muz. 459-22-17

TO

The Secretary to the Government
of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue Department, BANGALORE.

SIR

With reference to your letter No.240/Muz. 459-22-16 dated 19th August 1924, I have the honor to forward herewith, as desired, a copy of the - Judgment in Original Suit No.77 of 1918-19 on the file of the Subordinate Judge, Bangalore, (Sivapooje Waderu - Plaintiff VS. The Government of - Mysore and two others).

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Government Advocate.

In the Court of the Subordinate Judge at Bangalore.

Original Suit No. 77 of 1918-19.

Dated the 31st day of March 1923.

Present :- S. VENKATAKRISHNAYYA, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Subordinate Judge,
Bangalore.

PLAINTIFF.		DEFENDANTS.
Siva Puje Vadeyaru.	VS.	1. The Government of Mysore, by Chief Secretary. 2. Hunasamaranahalli Mutt, by Agent Nanjedevaru. 3. Sidda Wadeyer.

J U D G M E N T.

1. Suit for partition and possession of one half of Jodi Kempalingapur village and mesne profits Rupees 1500/-.

2. The suit was filed on 16-12-1918 in formapauperis and it is registered as an Original Suit on 30-5-1919. The written statement of Defendants 1, 2 and 3 were filed on - 22-7-19 and the reply thereto was filed on 31-7-1919.

3. The suit came on for settlement of issues on - 31-7-1919.

4. The following issues were settled :-

(1) Is the suit against Government of Mysore - maintainable?

(2) Whether Kempalingapur was granted to Plaintiff's grand-father as personal Inam or as Devadayam for the maintenance of the Mutt?

(3) Whether 3rd Defendant Sidda Wadeyer's suit - creates as resjudicate?

(4) Whether there is any cause of action against the 1st Defendant?

(5) Is the suit time-barred?

(6) Whether the Plaintiff is entitled to any and what damages and as against whom?

5. The suit came on for final hearing on 28-10-1919 and with adjournments on 15-3-20, 6-7-20, 21-12-20, 12-7-22, 7-11-22, 19-2-23.

6. The following witnesses were examined for the Plaintiff - (1) Gopala Bhatta, (2) Annayya Pandit, (3) Mylari, (4) Myake Nanjunda, (5) Myake Thimma, (6) Myake Nanjanna, (7) Doddanna, (8) Venkata Subbiah, (9) Papachari, (10) Nanjappa, (11) Rudrappa, (12) Lakshmiah, (13) Sivapuje wadeyer.

7. The following witnesses were examined for the Defendants :- (1) Mariappa alias Mare Gowda, (2) Muniga, (3) Bhadre Gowda, (4) Thoutaria.

8. Lists of documents Exhibited on both sides are separately filed.

9. Plaintiff has sued for partition and possession of ½ Jodi Kempalingapur village in Devanahalli Taluq., and for mesne profits Rupees 1500/- on the ground that the village in question was granted in the year 1812 as a personal Inam to his grand-father by His Highness the Maharaja Krishnaraya Wadeyer Bahadur. He has impleaded the Government of Mysore represented by the Chief Secretary as 1st Defendant, the Mathadhikare of Hunsamaranahalli as 2nd defendant and his own brother, who is alleged to have refused to join him the suit, as 3rd defendant. The cause of action alleged in the plaint is that under an illegal order of the 1st defendant, he was dispossessed of village and possession was given to 2nd defendant.

10. Besides denying plaintiff's title to the village defendants 1 and 2 pleaded that the suit was not maintainable and that there was no cause of action against them, that it was barred by time and also by the rule of resjudicata. 3rd defendant supported plaintiff's claim.

11. The defendants 2 and 3 both having advanced their claims to the Jodi Kempalingapur village the question went up before the Government of Mysore for their decision. As shown by the copy of the Government Order dated 17-3-1906 (Exhibit II) the Government decided against 3rd defendant's claim. Exhibit II shows that the points for decision - before the Government were (1) whether the village in question was given for the maintenance of a mutt or for the - personal benefit of the Grantee Viz., 3rd defendant's gandfather; (2) if it was the former, whether it was for the maintenance of any mutt in Kempalingapur itself, or for the maintenance of 2nd defendant's Hunsmaranahalli Mutt. The Government on the materials before it came to the conclusion that inam was granted for the maintenance of a mutt, that there was no mutt in Kempalingapur and that the inam was for the benefit of Hunsamaranahalli Mutt. 3rd defendant was referred to establish his right in a court of law and the inam was pending decision resumed by Government. As 3rd defendant did not file a suit within the time fixed and for some time after it, the Government gave possession of the village to 2nd defendant for whose ~~mxk~~ benefit the inam had been granted according to the decision arrived at. - Possession was given on 9-6-'09 while the order was passed on 7-3-'06.

12. Long after the time fixed by Government 3rd - defendant filed O. S. 114 of 09-10, against the 2nd defendant alone

alone on the file of the Chickaballapur Munsiff. His suit was dismissed. That decision was confirmed by the Chief Court in R. A. 27/10-11 as shown by the copy of - Judgment Exhibit XXIV.

13. The Honourable the Chief Court found that the inam title deed showed that the village of Kempalingapur was granted for the support of a mutt and not for the personal benefit of the grantee, that 3rd defendant had not shown that there was a mutt in Kempalingapur itself and that the grant was made for its up keep and that as 2nd defendant did not dispossess him he had neither title nor cause of action and dismissed his suit.

14. As plaintiff the brother of 3rd defendant was no party to that suit, he has on the self-same grounds brought this suit for the same relief.

15. Plaintiff's suit is mis-conceived and he has persisted in his error even after it was pointed out to him. Except perhaps when it is specifically allowed by any Act or Regulation, no suit lies against the Government of Mysore as such though it would be maintainable against the officers of Government for any act done by them. Under Section 229 of the Land Revenue Code no suit lies in this court against the Government or any officer of Government for any act done under that code. This prohibition applies only to Revenue officer and for acts done by them under that code, but not to suits filed against officers of other departments or for acts done other-wise than under the Land Revenue Code (Cf. 15 M.L.R. 243). Where the suit against a Revenue Officer for an act done under the Land Revenue Code, it should be filed in the

in the District Court. Under Section 12 of the Muzrai - Regulation where any person is dispossessed or any order is passed against him under Sections 9 and 10 and where any - person aggrieved by any order passed under Section 11, he should file a suit within 6 months of the date of the order against the Deputy Commissioner as Muzrai Officer, in the District Court. In this case the Government passed the - order resuming possession of the village under the Muzrai Regulation as the village was a Muzrai institution according to the definition given in the Regulation. The course open to Plaintiff was to sue the Deputy Commissioner in the - District Court as he was the officer who by himself or through his subordinates dispossessed plaintiff. Under these circumstances, the course open to this court was to return the plaint for presentation to the proper court for want of jurisdiction. The defendants had raised no objection to jurisdiction. I raised it during the course of the argument as any decision passed by me would be null and void for inherent want of - jurisdiction. When I questioned the plaintiff's Advocate on this point he stated that he had not sued the 1st for any act done or purporting to be done by it under the Land Revenue - Code or the Muzrai Regulation but that his suit was based on title and dispossession by defendants 1 and 2 who were acting as joint tort-feasors. From this statement, it is clear that plaintiff has chosen to take his stand on the ground of - tortuous act. Jurisdiction of a court to entertain a suit depends on the plaint as laid and not what the defence makes it out to be. The maintainability of a suit is different from the jurisdiction of the court to entertain it. For - instance a suit on an unstamped pronote may not be maintainable but the court may have jurisdiction to entertain it. Though the defendant's plea regarding the maintainability of the suit

as against

as against them may be valid, the court's jurisdiction to entertain the suit dependa on the plaint as laid. According to the stand which plaintiff has chosen to take in this case, there is no Act or Regulation which prohibits this Court from entertaining a suit for any tortuous act against the Government though it may not be maintainable. No suit lies against the Government except when it is established by precedent or permitted by any Act or Regulation. Suits against the Government as such at present, are not permitted for any tortuous act. I hold therefore that the suit - against the 1st defendant must fail as it is not maintainable. Plaintiff by the stand he took gave this court a - jurisdiction which in the proper aspect of the case, it did not possess.

16. The suit against the 2nd defendant, too, is not maintainable. It is the Deputy Commissioner by himself or acting through his subordinates that dispossessed plaintiff and 3rd defehdant on the authority of the Government Order Ex.II. Long after such dispossession, the village was - handed over to 2nd defendant by the Deputy Commissioner. There is therefore no cause of action against the 2nd - defendant. This very point was decided by the Chief Court in 3rd defendant's suit in its judgment Exhibit XXIV. The suit against the 2nd defendant too is therefore not maintainable on the ground alleged in the plaint.

17. Even though plaintiff was not a party to the proceedings before Government which culminated in the order Exhibit II, still under Section 12 of the Muzrai Regulation as the person aggrieved by the order he should have filed his suit within 6 months from the date of it. His suit is barred by time also.

18.

18. He must fail on the merits also as Exhibit I, Inam itle deed shows clearly that the inam was granted for the - upport of a mutt and not as personal inam to plaintiff's - ncestors. Exhibit XXII dated 19-10-'08 is the settlement ade by the Inam Commissioner showing the suit village as - evadayam Inam. Under 21 of the Inam Rules, no civil court an question its truth or validity. In the face of it, plain- iff cannot be permitted to contend that the village was given s a personal inam. Plaintiff's suit thus fails both on the erits and on the question of law as well. For the foregoing reasons my findings on the issues are as follows:-

(1) The suit against the Government of Mysore is not maintainable.

(2) The village of Kempalingapur was not granted as - personal inam to plaintiff's ancestors, but was given as Devadayam inam for the maintenance of a Mutt.

(3) The suit is not barred by ~~jurisdiction~~ resjudicata as plaintiff was no party to the previous suit.

(4) There is no cause of action against the 2nd defendant and the suit against him is not maintainable.

(5) The suit is barred by time.

19. In the result I dismiss Plaintiff's suit. He will pay the costs of defendants 1 and 2. 3rd defendant will bear his own costs as is actively supporting Plaintiff's claim and appears to be litigating in his brother's name. Plaintiff will pay the institution fee on the plaint and it will be a - charge on all his properties movable and immovable.

Pronounced in Open Court.

Copy.
Government Advocate.

SD/ S. Venkatakrishnayya,
Subordinate Judge.
31-3-1923.

Muz 4]

2065

SUBJECT .....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Section Muz.
File No. 459-22
Serial No. 18.

Muzrai Secretariat
( )
, *the* 192 .

No. 927

Date of issue 25

To

The Govt Advocate,

Signed by [illegible]

Sir,

Adverting to correspondence ending with your letter no. 488 dt 26th June 1924 forwarding a copy of the judgment in O S no. 77 of 1918-9 on the file of the Sub Judge, Bangalore, (Sivaraje Vasara Plaintiff vs Govt of Mysore and two others) I am

over.

rected to request that
you will be so good as
to intimate the action
taken to recover the
institution fees and the
defendants' costs in the suit
as ordered by the court

I have the

3.1.25

honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient
servant
Sd/ Registrar.

2/1/25

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27 7 22

SUBJECT 2 D/C

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Section Mavz

File No 45 G.-22.

Serial No.

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, *the* 192 .

No. 990

Date of issue 7.1.25

Signed by [illegible]

To The Muz Comr.

Sir,

In contn of this office letter no. 1018-Muz. 459-22 dy 26-1-1924 in the matter of the Govt Advocate's bill for Rs 300/. being his remuneration for services rendered in Cr. Misc. O.S. no. 77 of 1918. on the file of the Dist Judge, Bangalore Dist

over.

Sriapraja Vaderu vs Govt of
Mysore), I am directed to
state that Thanga the Govt
was nominally a defendant in
the Suit, as the object of
the Suit was to dispossess
the 2nd defdt (the Hunsomanahalli
Matt) of the inam lands in
question and obtain them
for the plaintiff. The Matt
should be asked to pay the
Govt Advocate's Bill,
and to request that you
will be so good to address
the above Matt in the matter
and report the result
at an early date.

I have etc.

3.1.25.

By the Rev. Secretary

21.1.25

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2,500 -27 7 22

S 7

e refer to
22
cl. address :—
"JURIST," Bangalore.

31384

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE IN MYSORE

Bangalore 20th January 1925.

FROM



K. SHANKARANARAYANA RAO, ESQ, M A, B.L.,
GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE IN MYSORE,
BANGALORE.

Muz. 459-22-18.

To

The Secretary to the Government
of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue Department, BANGALORE.

SIR,

With reference to your letter No. 989/Muz., 459-22-18, dated the 7th January 1925, I have the honor to ~~xx~~ state that it was not possible to take any action, immediately after the disposal of the suit by the Sub Judge, in the matter of recovering the institution fees and the costs decreed in favour of Government, as the Plaintiff in the case happens to be a pauper having absolutely no property.

2. The next best course, therefore, was to wait till he filed an appeal and to apply to the ~~to the~~ Court, thereafter, for calling upon him to give security, not only for the costs of the suit and appeal, but also for the institution fee. Accordingly, after service of notice of appeal, I applied to the Chief Court for ~~the~~ directing the appellant to furnish security and under the orders of the Court, the Plaintiff got one Lingappa, son of Veerasangappa, residing at Honnagara, Anckal Taluk, to execute a surety bond in favour of the Court, for costs in both courts and the institution fee.

3. On the report of the Amildar of the Taluk to the effect that the surety possesses properties worth Rs.2,000/-, the court has accepted the surety.

4. Further

4. Further action for the recovery of the costs, etc., will have to be taken only after the disposal of the appeal now pending before the Chief Court.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Government Advocate.

00749

No. 4925/25-4 Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Dated Bangalore, 2nd July 1925.

From

C. S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esquire., B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

To

K.V. Anantaraman, Esquire., B.A.,

Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.1018/M.F.459-22 dated 26th January 1924 and subsequent communications in the matter of the --- remuneration payable to Government Advocate in connection with O.S. No.77 of 1918-19 on the file of the Sub Judge, Bangalore (Siva Puje Vaderu Vs. Government of Mysore), I have the honor to state that in pursuance of the instructions conveyed in your letter of the 7th -- January 1925, the agent of the Hunsamaranahalli matha, the 2nd --- Defendant in the suit, was called upon to pay the Government ------ Advocate's bill. A copy of the reply received from him stating that for reasons stated there in he can not see his way to pay the amount claimed is herewith submitted.

2. In connection with the same matter, I submit herewith a copy of letter No.1020 dated 25-6-25 from the Government Advocate intimating that the appellant in the case has furnished security for costs in persuance of the order passed by the Chief Court on 5th March 1924 and that the case itself has been posted for hearing to the 26th -- August 1925. As costs to the extent of Rs.1125/- including the -- court fee of Rs.475-0-0 payable to Government in the Lower Court, (Vide Government Advocates letter No.658 dated 6th March 1924 addressed to you) have thus been secured, the remuneration payable to Government Advocate has, ultimately to be met out of the above in view of the attitude taken by the matt agent.

As security for costs to be incurred in the Chief Court on --

I am of opinion that we cannot now choose to remain expar allow the 11 defendant to conduct the case, as stated in the --- penultimate para of his letter dated 6-4-1925. The Government --- Advocate may therefore be requested to appear on behalf of Government and conduct the case.

3. As regards the charges incurred till now and due yet in the case I recommend that they may be met out of the provision made under 18 Courts of Law 2 Law Officers-fees to Advocates and other Law charges - I do not think it is proper to ask the ---- Advocate to wait till the costs are recovered from the other party.

In view of the urgency pointed out by the Government ---- Advocate I solicit the favour of early orders in the matter.

I have the honor to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

C S Balasundaram

Muzrai Commissioner.

KSR.

ter dated 6th April 1925 from the Agent of the Hunsamarnahalli

the Muzrai Commissioner.

"I respectfully submit that there is no justification for calling on the Matt to pay the amounts in question. The Matt had retained its own Counsel and paid them heavily too. Initially we had retained Mr.V.Venkatachar but as he died during the pendency of the suit we had to engage Mr.B. Vasudevamurty, Advocate. We never requested Government to defend the suit for us nor ever agreed to pay for its defence and as Government was defendant and chose to defend itself it must look to the plaintiff to pay its costs. The decree also provides for the costs of the Government being paid by Plaintiff and not by us. We have also to get our separate costs from the Plaintiff.

We made an application separately in the Chief Court for security for costs and the Government also appear to have made a similar application and order having been passed in this matter the Plaintiff has furnished security for the costs of both of us and which was considered acceptable by the Court. The remedy therefore of the Government to recover the amount due to it by way of costs is therefore against the Plaintiff alone and we are not liable for the costs of Government's defence.

Even in the Chief Court the Government may, if it is chooses, defend the action or keep exparte. We have engaged our own Counsel and propose to fight out the Plaintiff ourselves as far as we are --- concerned.

Under these circumstances, I respectfully submit I cannot see my way to pay the amount claimed by you."

"C o p y"

for Muzrai Commissioner.

KSR.

Letter No.1020 dated 25th June 1925 from the Government Advocate to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

"Re: Regular appeal No.155 of 1923-24 on the file of the Chief Court of Mysore (Sivapooje Wodeyar VERSUS. The Government of Mysore.

,,,,,,,,

With reference to your letter No.C.492/23-24 dated the 11th April 1925, on the above subject, I have the honor to state that the Appellant in the above case, furnished security for costs ~~of~~ in pursuabce of the order passed by the Chief Court on the 5th March 1924, and has got a Surety Bond executed in favour of the court by one Lingappa, son of Veerasangappa, residing in Honnagere, Anekal Taluk. The Amildar of the Taluk has also reported that the surety is solvent and the court has accepted the surety so furnished, on the 16th October 1924. The matter has been reported ~~to~~ by me for the --- information of Government, with this office letter No.633 dated the 20th January 1925. The case is now posted for hearing to the 26th August 1925.

2. In this connection I should like to invite your attention once again to this office No.751 dated the 27th February 1925, and to request that the sum of Rs.2/- only (Rupees Two only) mentioned therein (advanced from this office for filing the application for calling upon the Appellant to furnish security for costs) may be kindly arranged to be remitted to this office at a very early date. The matter may be kindly treated as very urgent as this item is pending adjustment for a very long time and the account will have to be closed before the end of the present Official year."

"C o p y"

for Muzrai Commissioner.

KSR.

G.R.S.&V.F.G-34]

SUBJECT..... .....

....

... .

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section Misc.

File No. 457-11

Serial No. 27

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* 192 .

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

Date of issue.... 9 II 25

Signed by.... Sec. to G.

Read—

Letter no. 1962—Misc 231-18-3 dt 23-1-19 requesting the Govt Advt to appear on behalf of Govt ~~and Conduct the~~ in Suit no. 77 of 1918-19 on the file of the Sub Judge, Bangalore (Sivappa Hoderu ~~&~~ Government)

Order Thereon—No.

Correspondence ending with Letter no. 633 dt 20-1-1925 from the Govt Advocate in the said case reporting that the Suit has been decreed.

May this be

i Printed ?

ii treated as a standing order ?

iii published in the Gazette, English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press ?

vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Sanction of Govt, a
sum of Rs 300/- only, being
his remuneration for professional
services rendered in behalf
of Govt.

Order thereon. 25-7/MU2459-22-22
Encloses 29.7.25.

The Bill for Rs 300/-
is sanctioned; The amount
will be
hereby debited as an
advance to be adjusted
after the question of
recovering it from the
Mahs is decided, and
The MU3 Cases is
requested to expedite the
submission of his report already
called for on the subject
in this Office Memo no. 990
Dt 7-1-1925.

2670

Dy. Regr. Secretary
29/26/7/25

To the Comptr. with the Bill
& MU3 — Cases
for Adjustment



Dated
Encls
17

Dy
3/7

Copied by

Examined by

WD 1666—GPB—1,000,00—21-1

65

JECT....

....

Diary No. of letter replied to .. ..

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

ie 191 .

Date of issue.....

Signed by.....

May this be

i Printed ?

ii treated as a standing order ?

ii published in the Gazette, English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press ?

vi published in the Gazette Kannada Part ?

Section

File No.

Serial No

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read—

Letter no 692/23-24 dt 3-7-1925 from the Inspector General in Mysore forwarding the petition in the matter of the restoration of the Jodi village of Kempalingapura in the Devanahalli Taluk, to the Order Thereon—No Munisubbaramachalliputta, Sir... Puje Vadeyaputta Plaintiff has appeared in the Civil Court against the Inspector General of the Sub Judge Bangalore in O.S. No. [illegible]

4 hearing of the
26th August 1925, and
recommending that the
Govt Area may be
represented & appear
on behalf of Govt
and conduct the ~~case~~
case.

Order 131-3/Govt-ST-24-23

The Govt Comrs.
recommendation is
sanctioned

21.8.25 P 23/8

Rec Secretary

Copied by

Examined by .

Dr. Govt Comrs Office
2 Copies
3 Govt Area Maps